

Dowens 2001-0189CON

Remarks

Reconsideration of remaining claims 1, 6-8, 11-17 and 21-24 is respectfully requested.

In the Office action dated September 22, 2004 (application Paper No. not shown), the Examiner objected to the specification and the Abstract and rejected the pending claims. Applicants will address each of the Examiner's concerns in the order appearing in the Office action.

Priority Claim

The Examiner first stated that the "as-filed" application lacked "the necessary reference to the prior application". In response, applicants assert that the Preliminary Amendment filed October 21, 2003 did indeed include an amendment to the specification (see page 2 of the Preliminary Amendment, copy attached as Appendix A to this reply) that added a cross-reference to the related application. Applicants assert that this amendment identifies the prior pending application in sufficient detail to establish a claim of priority thereto. Applicants thus respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this objection and enter the cross-reference information from the Preliminary Amendment.

Objection to the Abstract

The Examiner next objected to the Abstract in that it was not "clear and concise" and also ran over the 150 word count limit. Applicants have amended the Abstract, as noted above, and believe that in its amended form the Abstract is now acceptable.

Dowens 2001-0189CON

35 USC § 102(b) Rejection – Claims 1-6, 11-13 and 21

The Examiner first rejected claims 1-6, 11-13 and 21 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,650,800 (Benson). In response, applicants first assert that only claims 1, 6, 11-13 and 21 remain pending from the set cited by the Examiner. Moreover, independent claims 1 and 12 have been amended to emphasize the fact that the present invention is directed to using a security system platform in a communication network to perform the security administration service. The arrangement of the cited Benson reference, like many other arrangements of the prior art, transmits “alarm” signals to a “central monitoring agency” (see column 5), the agency staffed by individuals to answer the calls and dispatch the proper emergency equipment. The “network” discussed in Benson defines an interconnected set of surveillance equipment at a particular location. There is no discussion or suggestion in Benson regarding the establishing of a “security system platform” in a communication network, as defined by the teaching of the present invention. Indeed, at least one impetus of the present invention is to take the security system personnel “out of the loop” in responding to alarm calls, since there are times when the personnel do not provide the desired response.

Applicants thus assert that remaining claims 1, 6, 11-13 and 21 cannot be found to be “anticipated” by Benson. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this rejection and find claims 1, 6, 11-13 and 21 to be allowable.

35 USC § 103(a) Rejection – Claims 7-8, 14-20, 22-23 and 26

The Examiner next rejected the above-cited claims under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benson (as above), in view of US Patent 6,356, 192 (Menard et al.). It is to be noted that claims 18-20 and 26 have previously been cancelled from this application.

In this rejection, the Examiner cited Menard et al. as teaching “inter-protocol” and “inter-network” communication and concluded that “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the IP communications of Menard et al. for the telephone line of Benson because the internet

Dowens 2001-0189CON

signals can be provide through the telephone lines that including both voices and written messages to the user or authorization personnel such as police..". In response, applicants assert that while the alarm signals of Benson may be transmitted over IP communication lines, as taught by Menard et al., the combination still lacks any teaching of using a "network-based security system platform", as defined by the rejected claims. Without this teaching, applicants assert that remaining claims 7-8, 14-17 and 22-23 are allowable over the cited combination of Benson and Menard et al. and respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this rejection.

35 USC § 103(a) Rejection – Claims 9, 10, 24, 25

Lastly, the Examiner rejected claims 9, 10, 24 and 25 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benson and Menard et al., as above, in further view of US Patent 6,400,265 (Saylor et al.). Of the cited claims, only claim 24 remains pending in this application. Saylor et al. discloses the use of a "voice service VSS 16" which may be capable of responding to a verbally-provided PIN. Regardless of the teaching of Saylor et al., applicants assert that Benson lacks the basic teaching of the subject matter of the present invention regarding the provision of a network-based security system platform, as defined by claim 12, from which claim 24 depends. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this rejection and find claim 24 to be in condition for allowance.

In summary, the present application contains claims 1, 6-8, 11-17 and 21-24, where independent claims 1 and 12 have been amended to clarify the subject matter of the present invention. Applicants believe that the case, in its present form, is in condition for allowance over the cited references and respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejections and find the claims to be allowable. If for some reason or other the Examiner does not agree that the case is ready to issue and that an interview or

Dowens 2001-0189CON

telephone conversation would further the prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Jac P. Dowens et al.

By: Wendy W. Koba
Wendy W. Koba
Reg. No. 30509
Attorney for applicants
610-346-7112

Date: 12/20/04